

it is to keep it going on an orderly programmed basis.

I would like to just say a word about urban renewal which ties in so closely with many of the highway projects being undertaken. I believe it is the duty of all highway administrators to coordinate their plans with redevelopment officials.

Oftentimes locations for sections of the new highway facility can be located in part of the slum area or sections can be utilized for parts of interchanges, ramps, etc., designed to serve the area after it is redeveloped.

The cost of construction of a new highway, contiguous with an urban renewal project, often is allowed as a down payment, or part of the communities contribution to the redevelopment project. We should not pass up any opportunity to improve our local streets when an urban renewal project is contemplated.

Before closing, I would like to touch on a subject that has been kicked around like a football without a receiver. That, of course, is mass transportation.

I am firmly convinced that we must concern ourselves with mass transportation if our large urban cities are to survive.

We are all aware of the fact that in urban areas our traffic surveys, highway designs, and construction have not been adequate and we are still encountering traffic congestions.

I recommend that serious consideration be given to this problem by highway planners and that recommendations be presented by highway officials to State legislatures on how mass transportation can best be coordinated with a highway system.

In closing, may I say that all of you are making an outstanding contribution to the welfare of your fellow citizens. I trust that you will not be deterred by occasional criticism. Do the best job you know how, and I am sure that your fellow citizens will thank you for what you are—dedicated public servants doing a constructive job for the welfare of the Nation.

The Washington Post Endorses as "Sensible" Proposal To Make Unlawful Retired Officers Using Influence or Selling to the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on Monday joined with the Washington Star and the Washington Daily News in supporting criminal penalties for retired officers who use their influence or who sell to the Pentagon within 2 years after retirement. The action of the Washington Post makes the position of Washington's three great newspapers unanimous.

The Washington Post called my proposed amendment to the legislation which is scheduled to come before the House on Wednesday as "sensible reform."

Not a single editorial of any newspaper in the Nation that has been brought to my attention disagrees with me on the issue. From every section of the Nation

has come favorable and encouraging comment.

There is no middle road. Either such practices shall be permitted and given the blessing of Congress or shall be made unlawful by the imposition of criminal penalties.

"There can be no compromise with this issue. It is either wrong or it is not. I believe it is wrong.

The Washington Post editorial follows:

WHEN OFFICERS RETIRE

Two questions concerning retirement provisions for military personnel deserve public attention. The first involves the relatively modest problem of rectifying a defect in the military pay bill passed by Congress in 1958. This bill breached a century-old military tradition that retirement benefits should be related to active duty pay; it provided a benefit increase of 6 percent for officers who had retired before June 1, 1958, and continued the pay-benefit system only for those who retired after that date. Plainly this discriminatory policy has a demoralizing effect on service personnel. When the House Armed Services Committee begins hearings tomorrow there will be wide support for the legislation which would remedy this inequity.

A second matter, however, is far less simple. When some officers retire, they step into affluent positions with private concerns that do most of their business with the Pentagon. Investigations conducted by Representative P. EDWARD HÉBERT have disclosed a widespread disregard for the spirit, if not the letter, of conflict-of-interest laws.

A civilian official of the Justice Department is deterred by criminal penalties from accepting within a 2-year period of leaving the Government any private post that involves any matters he handled as a public official. However, when Mr. HÉBERT proposed a tightening up of similar penalties relating to retired admirals and generals, the House Armed Services Committee rejected this sensible reform. If the military has a just grievance in discriminatory retirement legislation, the public has an equally valid objection to practices which tend to tarnish the reputation of Pentagon brass.

In Support of Family Farm Income Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Record my statement, "In Support Family Farm Income Act of 1960," which I submitted on March 30 to the House Committee on Agriculture.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of a proposal which reflects the thinking of Representatives from both rural and urban areas. Its sensible and workable approach will benefit the farm community, the consumer, and the taxpayer.

My statement follows:

IN SUPPORT OF FAMILY FARM INCOME ACT OF 1960

(Statement by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT submitted to House Committee on Agriculture, Mar. 30, 1960)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity

to supplement my brief remarks which I made before you on March 2.

I join with my colleagues in support of the Family Farm Income Act of 1960. This legislation would raise family farm income, which will reach a new low in 1960, and would, at the same time, drastically reduce cost of the Federal farm program. I believe that in the long run the legislation is not only to the advantage of these engaged in agricultural pursuit who suffer gross inequality in the marketplace, but to the advantage of consumers.

Family farmers are entitled to sufficient income to maintain their families at a decent standard of living—a standard of living, I might add, which compares with the standards of people living off farms.

Other groups, including labor and business, are protected by many Federal laws and in addition, because of the nature of our industrial organization, have been able to increase their bargaining power greatly. As a result, business as a whole—particularly big business—is in a favorable position. Labor, where it is organized, is able to maintain a relatively good income.

Farmers, on the other hand, as the largest segment of our economy which is unorganized, have comparatively little bargaining power. Every farmer is competing against every other. When there is a surplus, prices may be driven to below cost of production. Industry, on the other hand, maintains its prices and merely reduces production when demand falls off. The record indicates that farmers, partly because their costs are fixed and partly because of the competitive situation, must go on producing more and more as prices decline.

That is the reason, Mr. Benson's effort to reduce surpluses by increasing production has fallen on its face. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture turned corn loose, lowered the support price but told farmers they could produce all they wanted to. The result is that corn is running out of our ears and the corn situation constitutes another farm scandal. According to the Wall Street Journal, the inevitable result of reduced price is increased acreage. Here is a quote from the March 16, 1960, issue of that publication which never, to my knowledge, has been called irresponsible:

"DE KALB, ILL.—Husky farmer Joseph Faivre may be planting something more than corn on his 640-acre farm this spring. What comes up next fall could be the biggest crop of trouble the administration's farm program has faced so far.

"In 1958, the Government's price support for corn was \$1.36 a bushel; Mr. Faivre planted 52 acres. Last year, the support dropped to \$1.12 and the Illinois farmer planted 186 acres. 'This year,' he says, 'it will drop to \$1.06, so I'm going to plant 287 acres.'

"With price supports going down, I have to increase my volume to end up with the same income," Mr. Faivre explains."

This bill—the Family Farm Income Act of 1960—would cost the Government very little by providing for payment-in-kind to the farmer who reduced his acreage. It would authorize a 10 percent deduction in acreage for which the farmer would receive nothing and an additional 30 percent reduction for which the farmer would receive payment out of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings. Thus, the surplus which is costing so much and which constitutes a major scandal would be reduced. In addition, the bill provides that farmers can get together and plan their production and vote on such a plan, a two-thirds majority being required to put it into effect.

I firmly believe that if something is not done to maintain and stabilize the family farmer that inevitably agriculture will be taken over by big business. Investigations of the House Small Business Subcommittee

No. 5, of which I am privileged to be chairman, indicate that national corporations are putting out of business small distributors of food products. Often the result of price wars carried on by large corporations is higher prices for consumers and lower prices for farmers. In some areas, where dairy companies carried on price wars, the consumer benefitted during the price war, but after the large corporations had accomplished their purpose of destroying local competition, they raised prices to a point higher than they were before the price war.

Investigations of the House Small Business Subcommittee indicate that chain stores are, to some extent, now taking over in the area of agriculture. They are engaging in cattle feeding and packing and they are manipulating the market, by-passing the Government regulated stockyards and paying the farmer the lowest possible price. At the same time, they have been raising prices to the consumer. For example, lamb producers a year or two ago experienced a net loss on their operations. Safeway stores at the same time raised the price of lamb chops to the consumers. I have introduced legislation which will prevent chain stores from engaging in agricultural activities.

The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 proposal is complementary to my proposed legislation which would prevent, or check, vertical integration in the food industry. It would give the farmer bargaining power and enable him to protect himself from price manipulation and discrimination practices of giant corporations.

The urban consumer, although he naturally wants to get his money's worth for food, has no desire to grind down American farmers to the status of peasant or peon. The urban consumer, I believe, is for fair play and not economic discrimination.

Critics of this 1960 proposal have not produce any convincing arguments against it. They talk wildly of regimentation. The farmer who is losing his farm, or is reduced to a state of penury because of low prices, is the one that is regimented—not the farmer who participates in a farm program to determine his own destiny. According to some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, this regimentation seems to consist of two-thirds of all the farmers participating in a referendum to determine what kind of a program they want.

What could be more democratic and more in the spirit of free enterprise? A referendum by farmers is no more undemocratic than a congressional election.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this Congress has a pressing obligation to act to resolve the farm dilemma created by a bungling administration. I likewise submit, respectfully, that the Family Farm Income Act of 1960 merits support and enactment as a practical, workable and fair means to resolve this dilemma—a dilemma which is costly to the farmer and the American taxpayer.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following report on the Cuban situation and Latin America has been sent to me by a constituent who has been making a study of the many problems confronting our Nation in our own hemisphere.

As the report is intelligent, clear, brief, and authoritative, I commend it to the House of Representatives for their thoughtful consideration:

I. Cuban sugar: If it is decided by Congress to cut the Cuban sugar quota and to redistribute it among the nations more friendly to the United States than Cuba, I think it would be very important to back up this action by reasoning which is as invulnerable as possible to attack on the ground of being just economic retaliation.

One line that could well be taken could be as follows:

(A) Cuba has gotten itself in a position of having a kind of monopoly on the Latin American sugar trade with the United States. Cuba attacks the United States on monopolies when it is following the same policy itself. The virtual Cuban monopoly does positive harm to the legitimate desire of countries like Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, Nicaragua, Haiti, Peru, Brazil, and others, to get a fair share of the prize U.S. market.

(B) It has been argued that if the Cuban sugar monopoly were taken away from it and sugar production was built up in other countries such as Mexico, Costa Rica, etc., that if and when Cuba would be a more reliable and friendly supplier of sugar to the United States, it would become desirable to again use large quantities of their sugar and this would cause trouble in the new countries. There are two possible fallacies in this point of view:

(1) The countries who are asking for an increased sugar quota to the United States are not doing so on the basis of building up their sugar quota but on getting a better price in the U.S. market for their existing production.

(2) Any proper reorientation of the Cuban economy in the future ought to involve less emphasis on sugar and a greater diversification of their agricultural production. At the very least Cuba ought to produce its own food crops, which it falls very short of doing today. Therefore there is plenty of room, after Cuba changes, to see that its restored economy follows sound lines.

II. Cuba as a base for subversive activities in Central America and the Caribbean in general: All the Central American governments and many others in the Caribbean area and South America also, have noted with alarm the tremendous build-up in activities of Cuba's diplomatic missions. For a little country with as few legitimate diplomatic problems abroad, an unconscionable amount of money is being spent by these Embassies and certainly—at least in Central America—the Cuban diplomatic missions are crudely intervening in the internal affairs of their host governments. The following activities are notable:

(A) Extraordinarily large and expensive propaganda campaigns. Masses of literature. Paid time on radio networks. Motion picture shows. Support and organization of "Friends of the Cuban Revolution" organizations are following an identical pattern in all the countries. Cuban Ambassadors are continually seen with and found encouraging leftist student and labor movements.

(B) In this connection the Communists in Cuba are clearly following orders from Moscow. In the past Moscow has been almost overtly using its tremendous diplomatic establishments in Mexico and Uruguay, for instance, as the focal points for dissemination of subversive literature and the carrying out of subversive activities. This conduct is becoming increasingly unpopular in the host governments. Mexico has declared certain Russian diplomats persona non grata and there are press stories that Uruguay is about to demand that the 80-man Embassy in that tiny country be cut down to 6 or 7, comparable to the Uruguayan repre-

sentation in Moscow. It seems clear that Russia, foreseeing a future limitation in Latin America on the illicit activities of their own embassies, is building up, under the cover of Cuba, a strong mechanism to keep the same work going for the future.

III. Cuban inspired third force labor movements: Russia, for a generation or more, has had a very strong Latin American international labor mechanism which has very effectively placed Communists in key positions and even control in a very large percentage of the Latin American labor movements. In the past this has been operated from Mexico by the known Mexican Communist Lombardo Toledano. The overtness of the Communist connection, just as in the case of the Embassies, is becoming embarrassing to Russia and the new tactic is, again, working through Cuba to set up a so-called third force labor movement through Latin America. It is understood that the Communists, for cover reasons, are prepared to sacrifice their current mechanism if they can get the other one going.

IV. The Cuban counterpart of UPI and AP press news services: Cuba has recently created Prensa Latina, a wire service available throughout Latin America and subsidized by the Cuban Government, no doubt with help in that connection from the international Communist propaganda apparatus. This service is furnished free where papers, as all too frequently in Latin America, have difficulty in paying for legitimate wire service. The legitimate news articles are heavily interlarded with Communist propaganda and all stories play up the Communist point of view.

V. Cuban supported revolutionary expeditions in Central America: Since the rise of Castro a dozen or more expeditions, supported with Cuban Communist experts on guerrilla warfare and with Cuban arms, have been keeping the countries in the Caribbean in a state of upset conditions and instability. All of these expeditions are operating under the guise of antidictatorship forces, which of course is a tremendously popular thing in Latin America today. In fact, the last thing in the world that the Communist conspiracy wants to do is to overthrow dictators. They fatten on the ability to use the dictatorship theme as a slogan and an entering wedge into liberal movements. It is only when the Communist conspiracy feels that it can substitute its own dictatorship in a country, through control of revolutionary movements, that it is really anxious to win a revolution. Thus, this multitude of small, 50 and 100 man, expeditionary forces, is currently being used for 2 purposes which give real fundamental aid to the Communist conspiracy. These are:

(A) By creating a climate in the press of the world that Central America, for instance, is in a very unstable political situation because of constant revolutionary action, they are accomplishing their major objective of trying to bring about economic depression in the area, which will set the theme for popular discontent and uprisings. The existence of this apparent political instability freezes up the desire of nationals of the countries in the area toward investing their own funds in development of their own country and has virtually killed all possibility of additional foreign investment.

(B) A more subtle purpose of the manner in which these 50- and 100-man expeditions is used appears to be a deliberate attempt to liquidate the manpower available to sincere democratically inclined revolutionaries who are merely discontent with their home governments. It is obvious that so long as there are strong non-Communist revolutionary groups, that communism operating through Cuba cannot hope to control any revolution that succeeds. However, once the more or less legitimate revolutionary forces are weakened then they will have to, if they